

**EXHIBIT 9**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

E: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE            )  
TRUST LITIGATION                    )  
  ) No. 11-CV-2509-LHK  
DOCUMENT RELATES TO:            )  
ACTIONS.                                )

---

VIDEO DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM CAMPBELL

ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY

February 5, 2013

Reported by: Anne Torreano, CSR No. 10520

1 Intuit, and she said okay.

2 Q. And can you place that either in time or  
3 describe the circumstances surrounding that event?

4 A. I -- there were some instances of Google  
5 recruiters calling Intuit employees. I was quite  
6 embarrassed by that with my own company, that I was  
7 there in such an intimate position helping Google and  
8 Google was recruiting -- cold-calling our employees.  
9 So I asked them if they would stop doing that.

10:07:30 1 0 Q. Prior to that time, did you know of any other  
1 1 companies that had such arrangements in the Valley?

1 2 A. Yes. I mean, yes theoretically. I can't tell  
1 3 you exactly what, but I -- you know, the idea of saying  
1 4 somebody's on somebody else's board and we don't

10:07:56 1 5 recruit from that board member's companies, you know,  
1 6 I've heard that a lot, but, I mean, I can't give you  
1 7 that specifically.

1 8 But it seemed like that was a practice that  
1 9 was being honored just out of respect for the board  
10:08:14 2 0 member's time.

2 1 So that's what I did.

2 2 Q. Okay. Aside from the situation where there  
2 3 were interlocking board relationships, did you know of  
2 4 any other --

10:08:30 2 5 A. I did not, no.

1 could go and recruit a Google employee, but we had --  
2 our opportunities for success were better other places.

3 BY MR. HEIMANN:

4 Q. So I'm going to come back to the question I  
5 asked.

6 Did you have an understanding that as part  
7 of -- strike that.

8 Was it part of the understanding that Intuit  
9 would not cold-call into Google the way you described

10:11:43 1 0 cold-calling?

1 1 A. No, we never had a -- you know, what you  
1 2 called a reciprocal agreement, no.

1 3 Q. So in your mind, during this time frame,  
1 4 Google was free to raid Intuit all it wanted?

10:11:56 1 5 A. No.

1 6 Q. Why is that not a no?

1 7 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: I think you misspoke.

1 8 MR. HEIMANN: Oh, did I?

1 9 THE WITNESS: I think you said it --

10:12:02 2 0 MR. HEIMANN: Other way around. I'm sorry.

2 1 BY MR. HEIMANN:

2 2 Q. So as far as you were concerned, Intuit was  
2 3 free to raid Google employees as much as it wanted?

2 4 A. Correct. Not likely, but correct.

10:12:14 2 5 Q. But correct. And did you ever confirm that in

1 MR. HEIMANN: Okay. Fair enough.

2 BY MR. HEIMANN:

3 Q. And now, I'm sorry, I lost my train of  
4 thought.

5 I think I was asking you whether or not you  
6 have any recollection of talking with Mr. Schmidt about  
7 the notion he expresses here, that if there was such a  
8 policy, it should be as he describes it here.

9 A. I do not have -- I recall talking to  
10:31:11 1 0 Mr. Schmidt about this, but not about this contractual  
1 1 agreement, et cetera. But -- but the business  
1 2 relationship part of it was something that both -- that  
1 3 he felt strongly about, as did I.

1 4 Q. Can you explain what you mean by that?

10:31:39 1 5 A. Mr. Schmidt being on Apple's board or Art  
1 6 Levinson being on Google's board, or me, you know,  
1 7 being a consultant to Google. You know, there are  
1 8 business relationships that -- that, for a matter of  
1 9 almost embarrassment, that he felt -- I don't want to  
10:32:06 2 0 speak for Eric Schmidt, but I felt, in consulting with  
2 1 him, that were important things to maintain. Those  
2 2 relationships were important and that we should not do  
2 3 anything that would affect those relationships.

2 4 Q. And how if at all did that translate into the  
10:32:27 2 5 conduct involving cold-calling into other companies'

Deposition of William Campbell

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Anne Torreano, Certified Shorthand Reporter  
used in the State of California, License No. 10520,  
by certify that the deponent was by me first duly  
n, and the foregoing testimony was reported by me  
was thereafter transcribed with computer-aided  
scription; that the foregoing is a full, complete,  
true record of said proceedings.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
rney for either or any of the parties in the  
going proceeding and caption named or in any way  
rested in the outcome of the cause in said caption.

The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of  
original transcript will render the reporter's  
ificates null and void.

In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name  
8th day of February, 2013.

☐ Reading and Signing was requested.

☐ Reading and Signing was waived.

☒ Reading and Signing was not requested.

Anne Torreano  
ANNE M. TORREANO, CSR NO. 10520